THE RELATION

OF THE

MORAVIAN CHURCH

TO THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

OR THE

ANGLICAN COMMUNION.

By BISHOP E. R. HASSÉ.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

London:
MORAVIAN PUBLICATION OFFICE,
32 FETTER LANE, E.C.

The Relation of our Church

TO THE

Church of England (or the Anglican Communion.)

By Bishop E. R. Hassé.

THIS subject is one of special interest to us just now. It has come into marked prominence since our Synod at Bedford in 1903 practically unanimously adopted the Report on our Orders then presented to it, and decided that the same should be sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury as a contribution on our part to the question that had been before three previous Lambeth Conferences. But the subject is no new one, nor can it be viewed merely in the light of the present. It must be regarded as a part of the larger whole; it must be dealt with historically. The connection between the two Churches takes us far back into the past; nor is this to be wondered at, considering the characteristic genius of our Church, and the many features that are common to the two Communions. Not to mention the influence of the writings of Wycliffe, the Englishman, upon Huss, the Bohemian, and the men of his day, and those who in the Providence of God were instrumental in founding our Church, there is evidence that for some 300 years communications have passed, and a connection has been maintained, between Anglican divines and the authorities of the Unitas Fratrum.

After the Reformation, among the Protestant Churches of Europe, there was naturally, in face of the common enemy at Rome, a desire to draw as closely together as possible; and to no Church was the longing for union more dear than to our own. It had been so from the very beginning. Indeed, in all our past history few features are more striking than the efforts made by our forefathers to promote the unity of the

children of God in the communion of saints. Already in 1480 the Synod decided to send out four of its leading members with a roving commission to search Asia, Africa, and Europe in the hope of finding some body of believers with whom Christian fellowship could be established. The four, led by Luke of Prague, journeyed East to Constantinople, and there they were separated. One set out for India; a second visited Egypt; the others reached Antioch, Damascus, and Jerusalem; and finally they all returned with the report that their quest had been in vain. At the Synod of 1486 a series of remarkable resolutions was passed on the subject of inter-communion with other Churches, and these marked the policy of the Unitas for future times. Amongst them is one to this effect: "If a number of priests of another Church (are found) united together by a right order of things, and feeding the people entrusted to them with the pure Word of God . . . then it is for the elders of the Brethren's Church to examine whether they cannot in some measure become united to such in the one body of Christ." And another was: "If God should raise up anywhere in the world right-minded teachers and Church reformers, we will make common cause with them." The Brethren were not discouraged by the failure of their first embassy, for in 1497 Luke of Prague was again sent forth, this time to travel through Europe. Very soon after the beginning of the Reformation in 1517 they were in close communication with Luther; and, later on, with the Calvinistic Churches of Switzerland and France.

Intercourse with the English Universities.

Personal intercourse was established with the English Universities; scholarships existed already in the reign of Elizabeth at Oxford for members of our Church studying for the ministry. A still closer connection is that associated with the name of John Dury, who about 1630 was a Continental chaplain, and as such did much to promote Christian unity. He made the aquaintance abroad of Samuel Hartlib, an ardent educationalist, and through him he came into touch with John Amos Comenius, a still higher authority on this subject. Already a Bishop of our Church, and the author of the

celebrated "Janua linguarum reserata," which was translated into nearly every European language (a most remarkable and probably unique fact for a book of that kind at that time), Comenius came to England at the invitation of certain members of Parliament, whose idea seems to have been to instal him as master of some University College, just as later on he was also asked to go to America as President of Harvard. The Civil War prevented the carrying out of the plan for his settlement in England, but the connection formed through his visit was maintained during the whole of his life; and when the Polish branch of the Unity was suffering greatly under Romish persecution, and Lissa, its headquarters, was destroyed, he appealed on its behalf to the Protestants of this country, and laid before the Archbishop of Canterbury a statement of the case; the document itself is still preserved in the library of Lambeth Palace. He also later on approached Cromwell when Lord Protector, and, as might have been expected, secured his sympathy and support, the result being that some £6,000 was here collected and sent abroad.

Comenius and the Church of England.

After the Restoration Comenius published in Holland his "Ratio Disciplinæ," which he dedicated to the Church of England and presented to Charles II. In the introduction he speaks of himself as the last of a long line of Bishops, and of his Church as apparently near her dissolution. He recalls her honourable past, maintains the validity of her Orders, and finally commends her principles and her large-hearted tolerance to his Anglican brethren. At the same time he was wise enough to know that personal connection was necessary if official intercourse was to be fruitful; and so he sent over to England his son-in-law, Petrus Figulus of Jablonska, and later on Adam Samuel Hartman, one of the Suffragan Bishops in Poland. The latter was made a D.D. of Oxford in 1680, and in his diploma his status as Bishop of the Moravian Church is fully acknowledged. This is all the more remarkable, since at that time it was essential that every recipient of a Divinity degree should be in Anglican Orders. In the

case of foreign divines, however, a letter from Canterbury or London was considered sufficient to meet this requirement. The fact of the degree having been conferred upon Bishop Hartman in the way that it was shows that then, by the University, our Orders were unquestioned. The same applies to his brother, Paul Hartman, who was ordained priest (presbyter) by Bishop Skinner, of Oxford, in 1660; his previous ordination as deacon in the Brethren's Church, in 1652 at Lissa, being apparently accepted. He afterwards was chaplain, or "Petty Canon," at Christ Church, Oxford, and died as rector of Shellingford, maintaining to the end his membership and standing in our Church. Indeed, there was an idea that he might as Bishop of the Unitas (to which office he was elected in 1675) superintend the Brethren who at that time already were living in England; but nothing practical came of it. All these eminent men were in close touch with the Anglican Bishops of their day, and worthily represented our Church in high places. Largely through their influence Charles II. issued an Order in Council authorizing collections to be made in all churches for the Bohemian Brethren; and Sancroft, the Primate, and Compton, Bishop of London, heartily endorsed the same.

Bishop Jablonsky and Union of the Protestant Churches.

The Episcopal succession was transmitted to Daniel Ernst Jablonsky, a grandson of Comenius, at one time a student at Oxford, and afterwards Court chaplain at Berlin. He, true to the character of the Unity, and in the spirit of his illustrious ancestors, endeavoured to effect a union of the various Protestant Churches. He suggested the introduction of the English Prayer-book into Prussia, and had a long correspondence with Archbishops Tennison and Sharp on the subject. What concerns us more immediately is that he, as a Bishop of our Church, introduced Christian Sitkovius, his fellow Bishop, to the then Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Wake; and through the instrumentality of the latter, the case of the Unitas was once more brought before the Privy Council, March 10th, 1716. The official minute begins as follows: "Upon a representa-

tion on this day made to his Majesty (George I.) by the most reverend Father in God, William, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, of the deplorable condition of several Episcopal Reformed Churches in Poland, &c., . . .''; and the result was the issue of another Cabinet Order, directing a collection throughout England for their relief.

Archbishop Potter and the Moravian Church.

In 1722 our Church was renewed at Herrnhut, and in 1735 Jablonsky consecrated David Nitschman its first Bishop. Two years later the question of the consecration of Count Zinzendorf to the same office arose. As it concerned mainly the work of our Church in the British Colonies of North America, then under Anglican ecclesiastical jurisdiction, he was anxious to know what the attitude of the Episcopal Bench at home would be in that case. He therefore had an interview with Archbishop Potter, who declared that ''the objections against the Moravian Church were frivolous; that no Englishman who had any notion of ecclesiastical history could doubt their succession, and that, for his particular, he was fully persuaded that they, with the utmost hazard if need be, ought to vindicate and defend the constitution of the Moravian Church.'' To a deputation that waited on him in regard to the missionary efforts of the S.P.G. in Georgia, the Primate further said that ''he had long been acquainted by books with the Moravian Brethren, and that they were Apostolical and Episcopal, not sustaining any doctrine repugnant to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion of the Church of England, and that he was confirmed in these statements by the conferences he had lately had with the Count of Zinzendorf.

On the consecration of the latter as Bishop he received from the Archbishop a very brotherly letter, from which the following are extracts:—''Most sincerely and cordially do I congratulate you upon your having been raised to the sacred and justly celebrated Episcopal Chair of the Moravian Church. I should be entirely unworthy of that high station in which Divine Providence has placed me were I not to show myself ever ready . . . . to especially love and embrace

your Church, united with us in the closest bonds of love, and which has hitherto invariably maintained both the pure and primitive faith and the discipline of the Primitive Church, neither intimidated by danger nor seduced by the manifold temptations of Satan."

The British Parliament and our Church.

In 1747 and 1749 two Bills were introduced into Parliament regarding our Church. The latter was entitled "A Bill for encouraging the people known by the name of the Unitas Fratrum, or United Brethren, to settle in his Majesty's Colonies in America." At the same time, in spite of this, its title, some of its enactments are expressly declared to be binding within the United Kingdom also. In the House of Commons there was little opposition, but in the Lords, Sherlock, Bishop of London, raised objections to the term "Episcopal Church" being used. The Scottish Peers (Presbyterians), headed by the Duke of Argyll, supported the Bill, since the Brethren had Elders as well as Bishops. The Anglican prelates also as a whole were in its favour, some of them enthusiastically so, especially the Bishop of Worcester (Maddox), who declared—"It will be an edification to myself and to the whole Episcopal Bench and all true Protestants of England if the British nation expresses itself in favour of the Brethren; for, whatever benefits England confers upon this ancient confessor Church must be an encouragement to all Evangelical Christians throughout the world to expect nothing but good from this country."

The result was that finally, on May 12, 1749, the Upper House gave its unanimous consent to the Bill, recognising us as "an Ancient Protestant Episcopal Church"; and there is little doubt that had Convocation then been sitting this Act of Parliament would have been supplemented by an authoritative declaration on the part of the Church of England which would have once and for all defined our position ecclesiastically as well as legally. But from 1717 till the middle of the nineteenth century Convocation was practically in abeyance, and hence through all these years the anomaly of our relation to the Church of England has been perpetuated.

By the same High Court of Parliament which "established" the National Church we also are recognised as an Episcopal Church—i.e., our Orders are admitted, with all that is thereby involved; but on the part of the Church there was then no endorsement of this, direct or indirect, and indeed no expression of opinion on the subject. In this state of indefinite uncertainty the matter was allowed to remain for over a century.

It was at the second of the Lambeth Conferences (1878), an assembly of 100 Anglican Bishops from all parts of the world, that the subject of the relation of our Church to the Anglican Communion was introduced by the then Bishop of Barbados, Dr. Mitchinson; and this not on any theoretical ground, but as a "difficulty he had met with in the administration of his Diocese." He submitted certain questions regarding the possibility of an interchange of the Ministry, in all its functions and offices (Preaching, Sacraments, Confirmation, etc.), between the two Churches. The subject was referred to a Committee of Bishops, but no report from them came before the next Lambeth Conference in 1888; which thereupon requested the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a Committee of Bishops, "who shall be empowered to confer with learned theologians and with the heads of the Unitas Fratrum"; it was further resolved that "they shall report to His Grace before the end of the current year, and that His Grace be requested to take such action on their report as he shall deem right." To this is added later on: "We shall welcome any clearer illustration of their (Moravian) History and actual status on the part of their own divines."

The resolution just quoted was acted on; the Committee met under the presidency of the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Harold Brown); and several of its members, such as the Bishop of Meath (Dr. Reichel), the Bishop of Oxford (Dr Stubbs), the present Archbishop of the West Indies (Dr. Nuttall), as well as Bishop Crighton (the man who, as inscribed at his own wish on his tomb, "tried to write true History") presented statements of their views and of the results of their researches. Correspondence passed between the Bishop of Meath and our General Directing Board in Germany on the subject of the origin of our Episcopacy and on the possibility of intercommunion. In reply of the

latter the following words occur: "As far as we are concerned such closer fellowship would be greatly valued by us, both at home and in our Foreign Missions, because we feel ourselves doctrinally in full agreement with the Anglican Church, believing and proclaiming as we do, in union with her, that we are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works and deservings; and because we are closely united in spirit with a large number of our Anglican Brethren as members of the one true Church of which our Lord Jesus Christ is the Head."

The Lambeth Committee was apparently so divided in its opinions that it was unable to agree upon a report, and thus the next Lambeth Conference (1897) again had nothing definite on the question before it. This explains the wording of its resolution to the effect, that not having sufficient information to warrant the giving of a decided opinion, it could only express a "hearty desire for such relations with the Unitas Fratrum, or Moravians, as will aid the cause of Christian Unity," and recommend "a further consideration of the whole subject, in the hope of establishing closer relations." The Archbishop of Canterbury was once more requested to appoint a Committee to conduct further investigation, and to confer with the authorities or representatives of our Church.

Three Features to be Noticed.

Up to this point all the approaches had been from the Anglican side, and in regard to them three features are to be noticed.

(1) The fact that the question was in the first instance introduced, and I believe I am right in saying, originally advocated by *Missionary* Bishops, proves that this is a matter that concerns not merely the British Province, but the Church at large. If it had not been for men like Bishop Mitchinson (of Barbados), Archbishop Nuttall (then Bishop of Kingston), and Dr. Jackson, Bishop of Antigua, who all knew our missionaries personally, and their characters and labours and the value of our Church's work abroad, the subject would probably never have come to the front at all. But things being as they are, it is evident that it must be regarded from the standpoint of the Unity

as a whole; it must be treated in the light of the possibility of our helping all the world over to justify the beautiful name we bear.

(2) The consistent kindliness of spirit manifested by our Anglican brethren is evidenced by their warm words of appreciation for our Missionary efforts, our zeal for education, and "the excellent methods and discipline which have especially endeared them to those Bishops of our Communion whose sphere of labour lies outside England."

There is also a strong expression in regard to "the duty of bridging over or removing the obstacles which at present separate the two Communions"; and the sentence in the letter of the Bishop of Meath that it was "the urgent wish of the Lambeth Conference that this might be possible."

(3) The fact must also be recognised that whilst the subject was treated on the historic ground ("it must not be overlooked that from time to time, up to the present day, very friendly relations have existed between the Moravians and the members of our Communion"—Lambeth Conference Report, 1888), yet *the object aimed at is one that goes further than the two ecclesiastical bodies concerned*, as is expressed, *e.g.*, in the Lambeth Resolution of 1897—"a hearty desire for such relations with them *as will aid the cause of Christian Unity.*"

The First Step on our Side.

Thus matters remained up to the year 1902, when the first step was taken on our side, and at our Provincial Synod in London the following resolution was moved:—"That a Committee be appointed to enquire into the possibility of more friendly relations with the Anglican Church by exchange of pulpits or otherwise." This was carried, and in the following year the Report of the Committee—almost entirely the work of the late Br. L. G. Hassé—was presented to the Synod at Bedford and adopted, and sent by order of Synod to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and also to all the Diocesan Bishops in England. In itself a most able and valuable treatise, a scholarly production animated by a truly Catholic spirit, it represents the only thorough enquiry into the origin of our Orders ever yet made from an English standpoint. Its clearness and accuracy sweep away many of the clouds that have sur-

rounded the subject, and serve to prove that both in the "intention of the Ministry," and also in the agencies which give effect to this intention, the two Churches are in substantial unity.

The "Committee of Divines."

The effect of the sending of this Report to the Archbishop was that in 1906 he appointed a Committee of Bishops and theological experts, afterwards known as the "Committee of Divines," "to study and report to him on the Orders of the Unitas Fratrum and their claim to the Historic Episcopate." This Committee had for its chairman the Bishop of Salisbury (Dr. Wordsworth), the other members being Bishops Gore (Birmingham), Harmer (Rochester), Gibson (Gloucester), Collins (Gibraltar), Macleane (Moray and Ross), and Mitchinson; also Drs. Bigg, Mason, Knowling, and Watson A sub-committee went more especially into the matter and drew up a lengthy report, which in draft form was courteously submitted to me. A good deal of correspondence passed between Dr. Mason and my brother and myself; we also met the sub committee and discussed the whole subject at some length. The Report was issued in October, 1907; it was, of course, a private publication, bearing no publisher's name, and was meant to be treated confidentially till it had been dealt with by those to whom it was to be submitted, viz, the members of the Lambeth Conference of 1908. The recent review of it in one of our German magazines was, no doubt, unintentionally, yet none the less really, a great mistake and breach of confidence. In this Report, which lays itself open to criticism at many points, the conclusion is reached that whilst a "succession of regularly constituted ministers has beyond question been maintained from the year 1467 to the present time," the origin of the Ministry is presbyterian and not episcopal. It was this conclusion which I challenged at Lambeth; and if this were the place to do so, it would not be difficult to give the strongest reasons for questioning it. But with the statement that the origin of our Episcopacy, in a technical sense, is an "insoluble historical problem," I quite agree; for whilst unquestionably we derived it from the Waldenses, no man living can say anything for certain as to where theirs came from, though there are traces of evidence that point to the possibility, or

even probability, of its having sprung from an Eastern source, and having been transmitted through the so-called "Sects" of the fourth to the tenth centuries. The study is a very fascinating one, but I must not enter upon it here. The concluding words of the Report of the Committee of Divines are as follows:—"The way to immediate inter-communion with the Unity as a Sister Church seems to be at present barred by the great uncertainty of its possessing the historic episcopate; . . . but any attempt to establish a union with them on terms which would imply an acknowledgment on their part that they have not the succession would be worse than useless. Nevertheless, the interviews and correspondence we have had with some of their leading representatives in England make us hopeful with regard to the future Certainly, in our opinion no effort ought to be spared which might lead to full communion with a body so zealous in good works, especially in missions to the Heathen, so charitable, modest, and unobtrusive in all its dealings with other Christian societies, and so large-minded in its relation to Christian truth, as the Unity whose principles were commended by Comenius to the guardianship of the Church of England"

To this I may add that on the part of this Committee some suggestions were originally made as to a system of joint Ordination of our Deacons and Presbyters. This was the revival of an idea that had been in Zinzendorf's mind, already in his day; and at first I was disposed to think that here might be a basis for future inter-communion. But further reflection led me to reject them, as I am persuaded our Church would do if they stood alone; and that because the starting point—*i.e.*, Ordination—is not admissible from our standpoint. It must be noted that in the Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference, as they have now come before us, the subject is approached from another side, and a very far-reaching and most important admission is made just on the point of our Ordinations; an admission which enables us to consider the present proposals in a new light, being different from anything that has ever yet been suggested. It bears out the truth of the words of the Encyclical Letter that "Wherever we have had reason to think that an advance would be welcomed, we have gone far to meet our Brethren."

The Friendly Spirit of the Bishops.

The course of proceedings at the Lambeth Conference was this—that every subject coming before it was first introduced at one of the full sessions, and was then referred to a sectional Committee. Accordingly, the question of our Church came before the Committee on Re-union and Inter-communion, and I was invited to meet the Bishops who had to specially deal with it. I also had in this connection some preliminary correspondence with the Bishop of Durham as chairman; but as all his letters were headed "Private" I cannot make use of them here. My impression of the time spent in conference with my brother Bishops (I use the term advisedly, for, indeed, they were, one and all, most brotherly, treating me quite as one of themselves) I have given in my address at Synod, and the other side is to be found in the speech of Bishop Talbot on the same occasion. His words must in this connection be specially studied, not only for their own sake, but because they reproduce the spirit of the Bishops. Every one I met would have spoken quite as warm-heartedly as he did, even if all had not been blessed with the same delightful geniality as our American visitor. The fact of the Archbishop sending his letter by such a messenger goes far to endorse another passage in the Encyclical, when it reads: "The careful report of our Committee (on Re-union, etc.) and the detailed resolutions may seem to some but cold in comparison with the warmth of the desires of many hearts. But such readers should remember the grave responsibility which attaches to the composition of such documents, and the necessity of accuracy, candour, and self-restraint, if the cause of unity is to be advanced by them."

Just that warmth of feeling which cannot be embodied in an official pronouncement going forth "*Urbi et Orbi*," may be expressed through the messenger bearing it; and this is what was done in the present case.

As all subscribers to the *Messenger* will probably not see the Lambeth Conference Report, it may be well here to give the section dealing with our Church.

The Unitas Fratrum.

"The subject comes before our Conference as one previously discussed in 1878 and 1888, when the matter

was left in suspense, and more recently in a detailed statement on the part of the Unitas (1904) regarding their succession and other questions, a statement framed expressly as an appeal to attention on the part of our Communion.

"In 1906 the Archbishop of Canterbury appointed a Committee of Anglican Divines to review the problem. In their recent learned Report, laid before the present Conference, they find the claimed Episcopal succession not proven.

"On the other hand, the claim of the Unitas to respectful and sympathetic consideration is in many ways unique, in view not only of its reverence for Episcopacy, and of its cordial attitude towards our Communion, but of its noble record of missionary service.

"The present moment is timely for the consideration of the question, as the annual Synod of the British Province of the Unitas meets next month (August 4th, 1908), and the decennial General Synod meets at Herrnhut next year, 1909.

"Members of your Committee have had the opportunity of meeting Bishop Hassé, President of the Directing Board of the Moravian Church in Great Britain, who was present by invitation, and a free interchange of inquiry and answer took place.

"Though personally challenging the conclusions of the Committee of Divines, the Bishop frankly accepted the position created by it for our side. His impressions as to the attitude of his Church as a whole towards closer relations with us were decidedly favourable.

"As a result of this interview and of subsequent discussions, four Resolutions are proposed by your Committee for acceptance by the Conference."

The four Resolutions are as follows:

I. (70) For the sake of unity, and as a particular expression of brotherly affection, we recommend that any official request of the Unitas Fratrum for the participation of Anglican Bishops in the consecration of Bishops of the Unitas should be accepted, provided that

(1) Such Anglican Bishops should be not less than three in number, and should participate both in the saying of the Prayers of Consecration and in the laying

on of hands, and that the rite itself is judged to be sufficient by the Bishops of the Church of our Communion to which the invited Bishops belong;

(2) The Synods of the Unitas (a) are able to give sufficient assurance of doctrinal agreement with ourselves in all essentials (as we believe that they will be willing and able to do); and (b) are willing to explain its position as that of a religious community or missionary body in close alliance with the Anglican Communion, and (c) are willing to accord a due recognition to the position of our Bishops within Anglican dioceses and jurisdictions; and (d) are willing to adopt a rule as to the administration of Confirmation more akin to our own.

II (71) After the conditions prescribed in the preceding Resolution have been complied with, and a Bishop has been consecrated in accordance with them, corresponding invitations from any Bishop of the Unitas Fratrum to an Anglican Bishop and his Presbyters to participate in the ordination of a Moravian Presbyter should be accepted, provided that the Anglican Bishop should participate both in the saying of the prayers of ordination and in the laying on of hands, and that the rite itself is judged to be sufficient by the Bishops of the Church of our Communion to which the invited Bishop belongs.

III. (72) Any Bishop or Presbyter so consecrated or ordained should be free to minister in the Anglican Communion with due Episcopal licence; and in the event of the above proposals—i.e., Resolutions 1 and 2—being accepted and acted upon by the Synods of the Unitas, during the period of transition some permission to preach in our churches might, on special occasions, be extended to Moravian ministers by Bishops of our Communion.

IV. (73) We recommend that the Archbishop of Canterbury be respectfully requested to name a committee to communicate, as need arises, with representatives of the Unitas, and also to direct that the decisions of the present Conference be communicated to the Secretarius Unitatis.

Questions on which light is desirable.

It will be remembered that on two points in the above Synod decided to ask for further information from the

Archbishop, and this will be done on his return from the Continent; but besides these two there are several other questions on which more light is desirable. All these, therefore, will not be touched upon in this article; they will be dealt with at another time. What may now be fittingly emphasised is the first proposal concerning the Consecration of our Bishops At such a service it is suggested that the Anglican Bishops should be present by invitation, and as assistants to our Bishop, who would primarily consecrate The fact of three Anglican Bishops being mentioned is merely bringing the ceremony into line with their own usage; as is also the case in a number of the expressions occurring later on in the Resolutions. The latter part, "that the rite itself is judged sufficient, etc," has reference to the fact that branches of the Anglican Communion, such as the Episcopal Churches of America or Australia, are wholly self-governing and free to make their own laws and to legislate for any conditions that may arise in their own country. The Lambeth Conference, therefore, was bound to frame its resolutions in such a way as not to interfere with this liberty of action.

The Vital Point in this Most Important Proposal.

But the vital point in this first and most important proposal is the fact that it implies in a most pronounced and unmistakable manner a recognition of the validity of our Orders such as has never yet been made by the Church of England. I was hoping all through the negotiations that it would come as it has done, but I scarcely expected that it would be so decided. It is found in the admission that our Bishop-elect, who is to be consecrated, has been regularly ordained, first as Deacon, then as Presbyter; and is thus, according to their own Ecclesiastical rule, and ours, qualified for the Episcopal Office. But who ordained him? A Moravian Bishop. Therefore the ordination thus conferred is admitted from their own standpoint as valid. It has always been the rule in historic Churches; "*Gradus conferri per saltum prohibitum est*," which means that in the ministry the order of Deacon, Presbyter, Bishop must be duly observed; no stage must be omitted; to consecrate a Deacon as Bishop would be out of order. And if in the Church of England there is any doubt as to the

regularity of anyone's ordination, he is re-ordained by one of their own Bishops. But that is not suggested here. Any of our Bishops jointly consecrated is to be "free to minister (as a Bishop) in the Anglican Communion"; admittedly, therefore, he was, previous to his consecration, a regularly ordained Deacon and Presbyter I do not know that in any other Ecclesiastical form this recognition could have been made more plainly than in the present one; the same point is also expressed in the latter part of Resolution III., which, in guarded words, such as perhaps were necessary to secure unanimity at Lambeth, opens the Anglican pulpits to us all, on the same terms as they are open to ministers of Churches already in communion with the Church of England.

For the Sake of Unity.

One further point I must mention. The preamble to Resolution I. begins, "For the sake of Unity we recommend," etc. This is what we have to bear in mind, even as it was in the mind of the Bishops at Lambeth. "For the sake of Unity" we on our part must not fail to use the opportunity that has come to us at this time. I would here repeat more publicly what I said at Synod, that, if we now reject the hand held out to us, and throw cold water on the suggestions made, we shall retard the movement towards the oneness of God's people; but if we meet these suggestions in a right spirit, the spirit which we profess to cherish, then we shall be doing much to fulfil the desire of our Lord as expressed in His Prayer, "That all may be one, as Thou Father art in Me and I in Thee, that they may be one in Us that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." Unquestionably much depends upon our present attitude and action. A grave responsibility rests upon us. If inter-communion is now established with us, further efforts will be made in the same direction, and in the next instance with non-episcopal churches. If we send back a "Non possumus," or lay down impossible conditions, we shall hinder, it may be for a generation, the cause of Christian Unity.

Our Provincial Synod referred the matter, as it was bound to do, to the General Synod of next year, in "the hope that it may be possible to arrive at an understanding,

mutually satisfactory and honourable, and that shall tend towards the drawing together of the people of God in all the Churches.

Let there meanwhile be much earnest prayer that in this important matter our Lord will guide us aright, and so overrule everything that His will, which is wise and good, shall be known and carried out by us.

There are great possibilities ahead. There are expectant hearts. As the Archbishop of Melbourne says in an article in the "Contemporary Review" (Sept. 1908), "Before another Lambeth Conference is held there are those who hope that great progress will have been made in the cause of Unity. The spirit of Union can grow only in an atmosphere which is congenial to it." And where should such an atmosphere be found, if not in our Moravian Church, the venerable Unitas Fratrum?